



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

SACHI A. HAMAI
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District


SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

July 5, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Sachi A. Hamai
Chief Executive Officer 

MEMO FROM POLLSTERS ON POTENTIAL NOVEMBER 2016 REVENUE MEASURES

On June 30, 2016, in response to the most recent poll by Arnold Steinberg, deputies from your offices raised questions about the various polls on potential November 2016 revenue measures for homelessness, parks, and transportation. In response to those questions, the pollsters collaborated on the attached memo. Please note that the table on Page 2 of the memo reflects polling results before any positive or negative messaging.

If you have any questions or need any further information, please contact Jim Jones, Chief Operating Officer, at (213) 974-1104 or jjones@ceo.lacounty.gov.

SAH:JJ:FAD
PA:ef

Attachment

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

Overview of Recent Polling Conducted – Potential November 2016 Ballot Measures

July 5, 2016

The following memorandum has been jointly drafted by the four polling firms involved with surveying on behalf of the County agencies interested in placing a measure before voters on the November 2016 County ballot. The analysis is based on the following:

- A recent Steinberg and Associates, Inc. survey for the County Regional Park and Open Space District assessing the viability of measures related to funding for parks, homelessness services, and transportation (sample size: 1,020; field dates: June 21-27, 2016)
- Three David Binder Research (DBR)/EVITARUS surveys conducted on behalf of the Los Angeles County CEO's office assessing the viability of measures related to:
 - Two surveys which explored funding for homelessness services and parks (sample size 3,005 and 750 respectively; field dates: June 18-26, 2016); and
 - One survey which explored funding for homelessness, parks, and transportation (sample size: 1,400; field dates: March 29-April 7, 2016)
- Two of FM3's County Regional Park and Open Space surveys:
 - One survey which assessed the viability of a parks measure (sample size: 1,218; field dates: June 1-6, 2016);
 - One survey which assessed the viability of ballot measures for parks (sample size: 1010; field dates: December 3-9, 2015)
- One FM3-Metro Survey assessing the viability of measures related to funding for transportation, homelessness services, and parks (sample size: 2,125; field dates: May 20-May 26, 2016 and May 31-June 1, 2016).

General trends across all of the surveys suggest the following:

- I. The levels of support for each of the three measures appear to be relatively consistent across the surveys. While Homelessness and Transportation universally poll in the high 60s to low 70s, all three measures do consistently poll above the mid-60s level.
- II. All three measures are viable at the supermajority level in November 2016—if certain key considerations are taken into account.

A number of electoral considerations will also likely be critical to strengthening the viability of each measure should they all appear on the ballot. The balance of this memo reviews key research findings underlying each of the above trends.

I. Levels of Support for Each of the Three Measures Appear to be Consistent Across The Surveys

First, it is important to note that, with the exception of the transportation sales tax option, either the tax rate or the funding mechanisms tested in the research has varied for the potential measures.

Nonetheless, each of the surveys points to generally consistent levels of support—with one exception (support for Parks' measure)—as outlined in the chart on page two. Due to the fact that the methodology used to test the impact of positive and negative information (messaging) varied across

the surveys, only initial vote totals are displayed. However, if the results of a survey indicated that negative information had a significant impact on support of any kind, it is noted in the chart.

Table 1: Levels of November 2016 Voter Support by Survey

Results Presented in Order of Most Recent Survey Conducted*

Table Includes the Margin of Error for Each Survey (MOE)

All Ballot Measures Displayed Would Require 2/3rds Voter Support

Level of Voter Support For					
Date	Survey	Parks	Homelessness	Transportation	Impact of Messaging
June 2016	Steinberg Survey	65% 1.5 cents/sq. ft.	69% 3 cents/sq. ft.	67% ½ cent sales tax	No significant impact
Range of Support Given MOE ±3.0%		(62%-68%)	(66%-72%)	(64%-70%)	
June 2016	DBR / EVITARUS Survey	71% 3 cents/sq. ft.	67% 3 cents/sq. ft.	—	Significant impact
Range of Support Given MOE ±3.5%		(67%-75%)	(65%-73%)		
June 2016	FM3 Parks Survey	69% Represents aggregate across 1.5 cents and 3 cents/sq. ft.	—	—	No significant impact
Range of Support Given MOE ±3.0%		(66%-72%)			
May 2016	FM3 Transportation Survey	—	—	64% Represents aggregate ½-cent sales tax and extension of a current sales tax.	—
Range of Support Given MOE ±2.5%				(63%-69%)	
April 2016	DBR / EVITARUS Survey	69% 3 cents/sq. ft.	68% ½ cent sales tax	71% ½ cent sales tax	No significant impact
Range of Support Given MOE ±2.6%		(66%-72%)	(64%-72%)**	(68%-74%)	
December 2015	FM3 Parks Survey	69% 3 cents/sq. ft.	—	69% ½ cent sales tax	Significant impact
Range of Support Given MOE ±3.1%		(66%-72%)		(66%-72%)	

**The Margin of Error (MOE) is ±3.5% for the April 2016 results for the ½ cent sales tax for homelessness due to split sampling.

The sole exception to the overall consistency of the survey results is the difference in support levels for Parks between the June 2016 Steinberg and DBR/EVITARUS polls. This discrepancy may be related to differences in the methodology (the structure and approach) of each poll. Specifically, *the Steinberg poll was designed to assess ballot order effects* while the DBR/ EVITARUS Survey did not test the impact of order in which the measures appeared on the ballot.

With these considerations in mind, there is no evidence in any of the polls to suggest that the presence of any single measure on the ballot, in and of itself, would harm the viability of the other measures.

II. All Three Measures Are Viable for November 2016 at the Supermajority Level

Generally, it appears that all three measures could be able to pass on the November 2016 Los Angeles County ballot.

However, a number of factors should be considered. We believe that the following conditions would maximize the likelihood of passage for all three measures if they appear on the November 2016 ballot:

- (1) Outside campaign efforts raise and sufficiently spend to reach out to Los Angeles County constituents likely to vote in the November 2016 General Election;
- (2) A coordinated approach across the three measures by the outside campaigns could help galvanize the demographics that are likely to vote 'yes' on all three measures; and
- (3) There is limited or no well-funded effort to oppose one or more of the measures.